EXHIBIT A

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	x RUBY FREEMAN, et al.,
4	Civil Action No. 21-3354 Plaintiffs, Monday, December 11, 2023
5	vs. 1:35 p.m.
	RUDY GIULIANI,
6	Defendant.
7	x
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL - AFTERNOON SESSION HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE BERYL A. HOWELL
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	FOR PLAINTIFFS: MICHAEL GOTTLIEB, ESQ. MERYL CONANT GOVERNSKI, ESQ.
14	ANNIE HOUGHTON-LARSEN, ESQ. WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP
15	1875 K Street, Suite 100
	Washington, DC 20006 (202) 303-1016
16	Email: mgovernski@willkie.com
17	VON A. DuBOSE, ESQ. DUBOSE MILLER
18	75 14th Street NE Atlanta, GA 30309
19	(404) 720-8111 Email: miller@dubosemiller.com
20	
21	JOHN LANGFORD, ESQ. PROTECT DEMOCRACY
22	555 W. 5th Street Los Angeles, CA 90013
23	(919) 619-9819 Email: john.langford@protectdemocracy.org
24	J 1 1 J 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
	(Continued on Next Page)
25	

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you've had a pleasant lunch, but now that you've been selected and sworn, I'm going to give you some preliminary instructions that will guide you as to how this trial will work and about some of the legal rules that are important in the trial.

These remarks are not a substitute for the instructions I will give you at the end of the trial before you start your deliberations. These are preliminary instructions, and they're just intended to give you a sense for what's going to be going on in the courtroom and what your responsibilities as jurors will be.

Now, you each found on your chairs when you came back a notebook with a pen inside a plastic bag. That's because I permit jurors to take notes during trial, if they want to, and to have their notes with them during deliberations.

None of you is required to take notes. Indeed, you should not take notes if you think that note-taking might distract you from listening to the evidence and watching the depositions or distract your attention in any way from looking at the witnesses.

On the other hand, if you think that taking notes might better focus your attention on the witnesses and the

evidence or might better help you to remember what went on during the trial, you should feel free to take notes.

I leave the decision of whether or not to take notes up to each juror individually because it's my experience that different people have different ways of most effectively recalling and remembering what they've seen or heard.

And so some of us do it better just by listening and observing; some of us do it better by taking some notes. If your notebook is more of a hindrance than a help during the trial, just put it under your chair and forget about it.

You should remember that your notes are only an aid to help your memory. They are not evidence, and they should not replace your own memory of the evidence.

Those jurors who do not take notes should rely on their own memory of the evidence and should not be influenced by another juror's notes. The notes are only for the note-taker's personal use in refreshing his or her memory of the evidence.

Now, whenever there's a recess during the course of the trial, just leave your notebooks and the pens in the envelope on your seats. They will be left there during short recesses. And also, when we take an overnight recess, Mr. Coates will collect them and keep them in secure storage. No one, including myself, will ever look at your

notes.

You will not be able to take your notebooks home with you overnight or at the end of the trial. I'm sometimes asked about that. No, you may not.

At the end of the trial, after you have finished your deliberations, returned to the courtroom, and delivered your verdict, your notebooks will be collected and your notes torn out and destroyed. Again, neither I nor anyone else will look at any notes that you have taken during the course of the trial.

Now, there are no alternates in this case. This means that all of you are regular jurors and all of you will deliberate in this matter, so it is important that all of you give this case your most serious attention.

Now, during the trial you're going to hear me use a few terms that you may not have heard before. Let me briefly explain some of the most common terms to you.

The party who sues is called the plaintiff. When I refer to the plaintiffs, I am talking about the plaintiffs Ruby Freeman and Shaye Moss.

The party being sued is called the defendant. In this action, when I speak of the defendant, I am referring to Rudolph Giuliani.

When I refer to counsel, that's just another way of saying "lawyer."

And the plaintiffs' attorneys are Michael Gottlieb, Meryl Governski, John Langford, Von DuBose, and Annie Houghton-Larson.

And the defendant's attorney is Joseph Sibley.

When I sustain an objection that a lawyer has made to testimony or evidence, I am excluding that evidence from this trial for a good reason. When you have heard that I have overruled an objection, I am permitting that evidence to be admitted and for your consideration.

When I say "admitted into evidence" or "received into evidence," I mean that this particular statement or exhibit may be considered by you in making the decisions you must make at the end of the trial.

In the event the plaintiffs and the defendant stipulate -- that is, agree to certain facts -- you should consider any stipulation of fact to be undisputed evidence.

Now I will briefly describe or state again what this case is about before discussing some of the procedures we will use and some of the rules of law that will be important.

This is a civil case. Plaintiffs Ruby Freeman and Wandrea or Shaye -- she calls herself Shaye -- Moss claim that Defendant Rudolph W. Giuliani defamed them, intentionally inflicted emotional distress on them, and engaged in a conspiracy with others to do the same.

Plaintiffs served as election workers at the State Farm Arena in Fulton County, Georgia, during the 2020 presidential election.

Mr. Giuliani is the former mayor of New York City, an attorney who has practiced law for decades, and a current media personality with his own radio shows and podcasts.

Mr. Giuliani headed the Trump campaign legal team during former president Donald J. Trump's unsuccessful bid for reelection in 2020 and was part of the campaign to undermine the legitimacy of that election in battleground states like Georgia.

Mr. Giuliani publicly and falsely accused plaintiffs of committing various acts of election fraud, including illegally excluding poll watchers under false pretenses, sneaking in and hiding illegal ballots in suitcases under tables, illegally counting ballots multiple times, and passing a USB drive with the intent of changing the vote count in the voting tabulation devices.

Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss allege that

Mr. Giuliani's actions have caused them to suffer and

continue to suffer extensive emotional and reputational

harm, including because Mr. Giuliani's actions made them

targets for profane and vile threats.

The Court has already determined that Mr. Giuliani is liable for defamation per se, intentional infliction of

emotional distress, and civil conspiracy, and that

Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss are entitled to receive

compensation, including in the form of punitive damages, for

Mr. Giuliani's willful conduct.

The only issue remaining in this trial is for the jury, you all, to determine any amount of damages

Mr. Giuliani owes to plaintiffs for the damage caused by his conduct.

This is a somewhat unusual case because, unlike many other jury trials, in this case certain matters have already been decided. I'm going to explain what has already been decided in this case and what you, the jury, will have to decide.

You are not being asked to and you must not reconsider any of the issues that have already been decided in this case. Before I give you instructions about what has been decided, I will tell you the reason.

In a federal civil action like this case, parties are entitled to the disclosure of all relevant, non-privileged evidence in the other party's possession or control during a process called discovery. That evidence can include relevant documents and electronically stored information such as defendant's computer files, emails, text messages, online chats, social media accounts, and call logs.

Since each party is entitled to obtain the other side's records, all parties to a lawsuit must preserve their records. The federal rules require parties to preserve and produce the records so that there will be a level playing field when plaintiffs try to prove their claims and defendants try to prove any defenses to those claims.

In this case, the Court found that Mr. Giuliani willfully refused to comply with his discovery obligations, including by failing to preserve all relevant records and failing to provide plaintiffs with all relevant records.

Those records include relevant communications and documents whether stored in a filing cabinet or on a computer or phone.

The Court also found that Mr. Giuliani's willful refusal to comply with his discovery obligations caused the plaintiffs prejudice, which means that it harmed their ability to prove their claims.

by Mr. Giuliani's misconduct in complying with the rules for fair discovery in a federal civil action, the Court has issued certain orders that Mr. Giuliani is liable to plaintiffs on their three claims against him without the plaintiffs having to produce any more evidence than they already have given his failure to produce relevant records.

Also under these orders certain facts must be

assumed in this case. As I will explain again at the end of the trial, this means that you will be required to assume certain facts in calculating the amount, if any, of awards of compensatory and punitive damages.

I will first explain plaintiffs' three claims for which Mr. Giuliani is liable and then instruct you on the facts that must be assumed in this case as you make your determination of any damages owed by Mr. Giuliani to plaintiffs.

It has already been established in this case that Mr. Giuliani is liable to plaintiffs for defamation, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and civil conspiracy. It has also been decided that Mr. Giuliani's conduct was willful, and that, as a result, plaintiffs are also entitled to punitive damages.

I will explain what each of those terms means in a moment. For now, I want to emphasize that you are not being asked to and must not reconsider any of these matters; instead, your only role is to determine any amount of money damages that Mr. Giuliani owes to plaintiffs in the form of compensatory and punitive damages. In making that determination, you must decide the issues presented to you based on the instructions you receive now and at the end of the case based on the evidence that you have heard and the instructions you have received.

So that you understand what has already been decided, I will now describe the elements of each of plaintiffs' claims. The elements describe the necessary conditions for a legally valid claim. These are the elements of each of plaintiffs' three claims that have already been decided.

It already has been decided that Mr. Giuliani is liable to plaintiffs for defamation. That means that you must accept, for purposes of this trial, that Mr. Giuliani defamed Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss by publishing certain false and defamatory statements about them, that Mr. Giuliani published these statements with actual malice, that Mr. Giuliani had no legal right to do so, and that these defamatory statements caused harm to Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss. These statements are what you will hear referred to today as the actionable statements.

The conclusion that Mr. Giuliani published his statements about Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss means that he personally communicated statements about Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss to third parties or that he caused other people to communicate the actionable statements to third parties. The conclusion of the actionable statements were false means that they were not true.

In this case the Court has already decided that the actionable statements were defamatory. A defamatory

statement is one that would tend to injure plaintiffs in their trade, profession, or community standing or lower them in the estimation of the community. In particular, the Court has concluded that the actionable statements falsely accused Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss of committing crimes. This is a serious type of defamation known as defamation per se.

When a defendant commits defamation per se, the defendants need not prove that they were actually injured by the statements; instead, the law presumes that plaintiffs were injured. In this case you may presume that the actionable statements injured Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss in their trade, profession, and community standing, and lowered them in the estimation of the community.

The conclusion that Mr. Giuliani made the actionable statements without privilege to a third party means that he did not have a separate legal right to make them.

The conclusion that Mr. Giuliani published the actionable statements with actual malice means that Mr. Giuliani knew his statements about Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss were false, or he recklessly disregarded whether they were true at the time that he published those statements. In other words, the Court has found that Mr. Giuliani acted at least with a high degree of awareness that the statements were probably false.

The Court's finding that Mr. Giuliani caused harm to Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss means that they suffered harm as a result of the defamation.

The Court has also found Mr. Giuliani liable for intentional infliction of emotional distress. That means that you are to accept, for purposes of this trial, that Mr. Giuliani intentionally inflicted emotional distress on plaintiffs by engaging in extreme and outrageous conduct that intentionally or recklessly caused Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss to suffer severe emotional distress.

The Court has also found that Mr. Giuliani engaged in a civil conspiracy to commit the torts of defamation and intentional infliction of emotional distress on or before December 3, 2020, with Donald J. Trump, the Trump 2020 presidential campaign's legal team headed by Mr. Giuliani, the One America News network -- called for short OAN -- OAN reporters, and others. That means that Mr. Giuliani agreed with his co-conspirators to commit defamation and intentional infliction of emotional distress and took certain acts in furtherance of that agreement.

As a result of this finding, Mr. Giuliani is liable in this case not just for the harm caused by his own actions, but also for the harm caused by the actions that his co-conspirators took in furtherance of the same conspiracy.

Now, to address the unfairness to the plaintiffs caused by Mr. Giuliani's willful failure to comply with his discovery obligations, the Court has issued certain orders about what facts must be assumed in this case, including about damages. And I will explain this again at the end of the trial in final instructions that you will have in writing, so if you don't want to try and jot all this down, just listen carefully.

You will be required to assume certain facts in calculating any awards of compensatory and punitive damages.

You must assume that Mr. Giuliani received substantial financial benefits from his defamation of Ms. Freeman and Ms. Moss.

You must assume that Mr. Giuliani was intentionally trying to hide evidence about his financial assets for the purpose of artificially deflating his net worth.

You must assume that Mr. Giuliani was intentionally trying to hide evidence about the viewership of his video podcast and his social media reach for the purpose of artificially deflating the reach of his defamatory statements.

You must assume that Mr. Giuliani was intentionally trying to hide evidence about the finances of his businesses, Giuliani Communications LLC and Giuliani

Partners LLC, for the purpose of shielding his assets from discovery and artificially deflating his net worth.

And you must assume Mr. Giuliani's businesses,
Giuliani Communications LLC and Giuliani Partners LLC,
continue to generate advertising revenue and other income
from their operations.

Now, as I have explained, your duty in this case is limited to determining any amount of money damages to award plaintiffs. The amount of money awarded to a party in a civil suit like this one is called damages. The Court has already determined that plaintiffs are entitled to an award of two forms of damages, compensatory and punitive.

Compensatory damages are the amount of money that will fairly and reasonably compensate plaintiffs for the harm they have suffered. As I will explain in greater detail, in this case that harm is not limited to physical and economic harm, but also may include things like reputational harm, emotional harm, and mental harm.

Punitive damages are damages awarded to a plaintiff above and beyond the amount of compensatory damages. Punitive damages are not intended to compensate a plaintiff for the harm that the plaintiff has suffered. Rather, the law permits a jury in a civil case to award a plaintiff punitive damages against a defendant as a punishment for outrageous conduct and to deter others from

engaging in similar conduct in the future.

I will instruct you in more detail later on the legal standards for how to determine the amount of damages owed. For now I'm just going to give you some general instructions.

As to the defamation claim, plaintiffs are presumed to be harmed as a result of the defamatory actionable statements, and thus they are not required to present evidence of the harm they have suffered for you to award damages to compensate them for that harm. You are entitled to consider any such evidence of harm, if it is presented.

Plaintiffs' burden in presenting such evidence is only to provide a reasonable basis from which you can estimate the harm to the reputations from the defamatory actionable statements. While you may not engage in speculation or guesswork, you are entitled to approximate plaintiffs' damages based upon the evidence they present.

Furthermore, if you decide that the evidence does not fully capture the harm that plaintiffs suffered as a result of the damage to their reputations, you may award an additional amount that using your good judgment and common sense you decide is necessary to compensate them fully for the harm caused to their reputations by the defamatory actionable statements.

As to plaintiffs' intentional infliction of emotional distress claim, plaintiffs must show by a preponderance of the evidence that they suffered damages in the form of emotional distress. If you conclude that plaintiffs have shown by a preponderance of the evidence that plaintiffs suffered damages in the form of emotional distress, plaintiffs' burden is then only to provide a reasonable basis from which you can estimate their damages. There is no exact standard or mathematical formula for deciding the compensatory damages to be awarded for this type of harm, nor is the testimony of any witness required about the amount of compensation.

While you may not engage in speculation or guesswork, you are entitled to approximate plaintiffs' damages based upon the evidence they have presented. To decide the amount that would fairly and reasonably compensate plaintiffs for emotional distress, you should consider the facts of this case in the light of your experience and common sense.

To establish a fact by preponderance of the evidence is to prove that it is more likely so than not so.

In other words, a preponderance of the evidence means that the evidence produces in your mind the belief that the thing in question is more likely true than not true.

The fact that plaintiffs have filed a lawsuit

against Mr. Giuliani does not mean that plaintiffs' evidence is entitled to greater weight than any evidence the defendant may put before you. If, after considering all of the evidence, the evidence favoring the plaintiffs' side of an issue is more convincing to you and causes you to believe that the probability of truth favors the plaintiffs on that issue, then the plaintiffs will have succeeded in carrying the burden of proof on that issue.

The term "preponderance of the evidence" does not mean that the proof must produce absolute or mathematical certainty. For example, it does not mean proof beyond a reasonable doubt as is required in criminal cases. For those of you who have sat as a juror in a criminal case, you will have heard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That requirement does not apply in a civil case; and, therefore, you should put it out of your mind.

Whether there is a preponderance of the evidence depends on the quality, not the quantity, of evidence. In other words, merely having a greater number of witnesses or documents bearing on a certain version of the facts does not necessarily constitute a preponderance of the evidence. If you believe the evidence is evenly balanced on an issue that the plaintiffs had to prove, then the plaintiffs have not carried the burden of proof, and your finding on that issue must be for the defendant.

As to the final claim of civil conspiracy, the

Court has already determined that Mr. Giuliani acted as part

of a civil conspiracy to commit the torts of defamation and

intentional infliction of emotional distress on or about

December 3, 2020, with Donald J. Trump, the Trump 2020

presidential campaign's legal team headed by Mr. Giuliani,

the One America News network, OAN, and OAN reporters and

others. That means, for purposes of determining damages in

this case, that it has already been decided that

Mr. Giuliani is liable for the harm caused not just by his

own actions, but also for the harm caused by the actions of

his co-conspirators taken in furtherance of the conspiracy.

Now I'm going to tell you about the parts of the

trial.

The trial begins with each side having a chance to make opening statements. The opening statements of the lawyers are not evidence, and they're only supposed to be a general statement of what the lawyers expect the evidence to be. They are intended to help you understand the evidence which will be introduced.

After the opening statements, plaintiffs' attorneys will present their witnesses in support of its claim. This is called direct examination.

When plaintiffs' counsel is finished, defense counsel may ask questions of each witness put on by the

plaintiffs. That is called cross-examination.

And after cross-examination is finished, plaintiffs' counsel will have an opportunity to do a redirect examination.

After the plaintiffs present their evidence, the defendant may call witnesses to the stand and ask questions on direct examination, and plaintiffs' attorneys may cross-examine those witnesses. And, again, the defense counsel will have an opportunity for redirect examination after that cross-examination is done.

During the testimony of witnesses you may sometimes hear a lawyer ask a question which contains an assertion of fact inside of the question. For example: The car was going 90 miles an hour, wasn't it, Mr. Witness? Please remember that no matter how sure or confident the lawyer sounds when stating the question, the assertion of fact by the lawyer in the question is not evidence. Only what the witness says in the answer is evidence.

So if the witness answers no, then there is no evidence the car was going 90 miles an hour even though the lawyer quite confidently said so. There's only evidence to that effect if the witness answers yes.

Now, during the course of this trial you may also hear reference to deposition testimony. A deposition is the testimony of a person taken before trial. Depositions are

used by parties in litigation to conduct discovery and to preserve testimony for future use in the case, including at trial.

At a deposition, the witness is placed under oath, swears to tell the truth, and lawyers for each side may ask questions. The court reporter is present and records the questions and answers.

During the trial you may view certain deposition testimony presented by video. You should give deposition testimony the same fair and impartial consideration you give any other testimony. You should not give more weight or less weight to deposition testimony just because the witness does not testify in person or live here in the courtroom.

Now, after all the evidence has been presented, the lawyers for plaintiffs and the defendant will have an opportunity to make closing arguments in support of their case. The lawyers' closing arguments, just like their opening statements, are not evidence in the case; they're only intended to help you understand the evidence.

Finally, at the end of all of the evidence and the arguments for both sides, I will give you your final instructions on the law that you are to apply in your deliberations, and then you will retire to consider your verdict. Your verdict must be unanimous.

Now I want to speak to you briefly about my job

and what your job is; that is, the functions of the judge and the functions of the jury.

My responsibilities are to conduct this trial in an orderly, fair, and efficient manner; to rule on legal questions that come up during the trial; and to instruct you about the law that applies in this case.

It is your sworn duty as jurors to accept and apply the law as I state it to you. Your job, ladies and gentlemen, is to determine the facts. You and only you are the judges of the facts. You determine the weight, the effect, and the value of the evidence, as well as the credibility or believability of the witnesses. You must consider and weigh the testimony of all witnesses who appear before you and must decide the extent to which you believe any witness.

You must pay careful attention to the testimony of all the witnesses because you will not have transcripts or summaries of the testimony available to you during your deliberations. You will have to rely on your memory and on your notes, if you choose to take any. It is your job to resolve any conflicts in the testimony which may occur during the trial and to decide where the truth lies, so please pay careful attention.

You may consider only the evidence properly admitted in this case. That evidence includes the sworn

testimony of witnesses, exhibits admitted into evidence, and facts stipulated to and agreed to by counsel. You may consider any facts to which all counsel have agreed or stipulated to to be undisputed evidence and also the facts that I will instruct you about as guiding your determinations in this case.

You may also draw from the facts you find to be proved such reasonable inferences as seem justified in light of your experience. Inferences are deductions or conclusions that reason and common sense lead you to draw from facts established by the evidence in the case.

As I have explained and will repeat to you before your deliberations, there are certain inferences that you must make in this case. You must accept as true all the factual matters already decided in this case as I have explained to you in these instructions. You must also assume certain facts for purposes of the case, and I will repeat those for you in the final instructions so you will have them fresh during your deliberations.

Certain things are not evidence and must not be considered by you, and this is a short list of three things that are not evidence.

As I mentioned, statements, arguments, questions, and objections by lawyers are not evidence. Testimony that the Court has excluded or told you to disregard is not

evidence and must not be considered. And anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide this case solely on the evidence presented here in the courtroom.

During the trial, if the Court or a lawyer makes statements or asks a question that refers to evidence you remember differently, you should rely on your own memory of the evidence during your deliberations. It is your recollection of the evidence that controls.

The lawyers in this case may object from time to time when the other side asks a question, makes an argument, or offers evidence that the lawyer believes is not properly admissible. You must not hold such objections against the lawyer who makes them or the party the lawyer represents.

Indeed, it is the lawyers' job and responsibility to object to evidence which he or she believes is not properly admissible under the rules of evidence.

If I sustain an objection asked by a lawyer, you should forget about the question because the question is not evidence; and you must not guess or speculate what the answer to the question might have been. If a question is asked and answered and I then rule that the answer should be stricken from the record, you must forget about both the question and the answer that was stricken. You should follow this same rule if it happens that any of the exhibits

are stricken.

If I overrule an objection to a question, you may consider the answer and treat the answer like any other. It is still up to you to decide how much weight, if any, the answer is entitled to.

Now, during this trial I may rule on motions or objections by the lawyers, make comments to lawyers, question witnesses, and instruct you on the law. You should not take any of my statements or actions as any indication of my opinion about how you should decide this case in terms of damages. If you think that somehow I have expressed or even hinted at any opinion as to how you should make your decision about damages, you should disregard it. The verdict in this case is your sole and exclusive responsibility.

Now, to ensure fairness, you must follow certain rules about your conduct as jurors.

First, you are not permitted to discuss this case with anyone until this case is submitted to you for your decision at the end of my final instructions. This means that until the case is submitted to you, you may not talk about it, even with your fellow jurors. This is because we don't want you making decisions until you've heard all of the evidence and the instructions of law.

After I submit the case to you, you may discuss it

only when I instruct you to do so and only in the jury room and only in the presence of all of your fellow jurors. It is important you keep an open mind and not decide any issue in the case until after I submit the entire case to you with my final instructions.

In addition, you may not talk about this case with anybody else. It should go without saying that you may not write about the case electronically, through any blog posting or other communication, including social networking sites such as Facebook or Twitter/X until you have submitted your verdict and the case is over. This is because you must decide the case based on the instructions I give you and what happens in the courtroom and not on what someone else may have said or told you outside the courtroom.

I am sure that when you go home tonight or when you call work to let them know you've been selected for a jury, you may be asked what kind of case you're sitting on. You may respond that you've been selected as a juror in a civil case, but nothing else. Between now and when you are discharged from jury duty, you must not provide to or receive from anyone, including friends, co-workers and family members, any information about your jury service.

As I said, you may tell them that you've been selected to serve as a juror on a civil case, and you may tell them how long you anticipate the case will last. You

must not give any information about the case itself or the people involved in the case because undoubtedly, if you do that, the person you're speaking to may want to share his or her own opinions about this case or the people involved, and you must not hear that person's opinions, views, or information because all those opinions, views, and information may be wrong and have nothing to do with the evidence that you're going to hear in this case.

You must also warn people not to try to say anything to you or write to you about your jury service in this case. This includes face to face or by phone, text, or email or through social media. In this age of electronic communications, I want to stress you must not use electronic devices or computers to talk about this case, including Tweeting, texting, blogging, emailing, posting information on a website or chat room, or any other means at all.

Do not send or accept messages, including email or text messages, about your jury service. You must not disclose your thoughts about your jury service or ask for advice on how to decide this case.

When the case is over, you may discuss any part of it with anyone you wish; but until then, you may not do so.

Second, although it is a natural human tendency to talk with people with whom you may come into contact, you must not talk to any of the parties or their attorneys or

any witnesses in this case during the time you serve on this jury. If you encounter people connected with the case outside the courtroom, you should avoid having any conversation with them, overhearing their conversation, or having any contact with them at all.

For example, if you find yourself in a courthouse corridor, elevator, or any other location where the case is being discussed by attorneys, parties, witnesses, or anyone else, you should immediately leave the area to avoid hearing such discussions.

If you see any of the attorneys or witnesses involved in the case or parties and they turn and walk away from you, they are not being rude. They're merely following the same instruction not to have any contact with the jurors in this case.

If you do happen to hear a discussion about the case, you should report that to me as soon as possible just by letting Mr. Coates know.

Third, it is unlikely, but if someone tries to talk to you about this case, you should refuse to engage in any conversation about the case and immediately let me know by telling Mr. Coates. Do not tell the other jurors. Just let me know, and I will discuss it with you privately.

Fourth, there may be reports in the newspaper or on the radio, Internet, or television concerning this case

while the trial is going on. If there should be such media coverage in this case, you may be tempted to read, listen to, or watch it. You must not do so. You must not read, listen to, or watch such reports because you must decide this case solely on the evidence presented in this courtroom.

If you are exposed to any press coverage about this case, you must tell me about it immediately by informing Mr. Coates. Again, you should not tell any of your fellow jurors or anyone else. I will speak to you about it privately.

Fifth, because you must decide this case based only on what occurs in the courtroom, you may not conduct any independent investigation of the law or the facts in this case or consult with anybody about the case. That means you may not conduct any research in books, newspapers, or through Google searches about anybody involved in the case or what happened in this case.

In this electronic age that also means you cannot conduct any kind of research or ask somebody for research.

Research includes something even as simple or seemingly harmless as using the Internet to look up a legal term.

I want to explain the reasons why you should not conduct your own research or investigation.

All parties have a right to have the case decided

only on evidence and legal rules that they know about and that they have a chance to respond to. Relying on information you get outside this courtroom is unfair because the parties would not have a chance to refute it, to correct it, or to explain it.

Unfortunately, information we get over the

Internet or from other sources, including media sources, may
be incomplete or misleading or just plain wrong. It is up
to you to decide whether to credit any evidence presented in
court, and only the evidence presented in court may be
considered by you. If evidence or legal information has not
been presented in court, you cannot rely on it. Moreover,
if any of you do your own research about the facts or the
law, this may result in different jurors basing their
decisions on different information. Each juror must make
his or her decision based on the same evidence and under the
same rules.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, do not make up your mind during the trial about what your final decision will be. Keep an open mind. Do not decide any issue in the case until after I submit the entire case to you with my final instructions. Then you and your fellow jurors may discuss the case during deliberations and reach your decision.

Your job is to decide this case without prejudice, without fear, without sympathy, without favor, and based

only on a fair consideration of the evidence presented in this courtroom. It is for that reason you must completely disregard any press, television, or radio reports that you may read, see, or hear about this matter. If any such reports come to your attention, it is your sworn duty to put it aside and direct your attention elsewhere.

Now, at the beginning of the jury selection process you were introduced to the parties in person, and other witnesses were identified to you only by their name being said. I want to emphasize that if at any time during the trial you suddenly think you recognize or might know a witness or someone referred to in the testimony or evidence, you should not tell any other members of the jury. Just let Mr. Coates know, and I will speak to you privately about it.

Now, the schedule we're going to follow during the trial is that we will try to start promptly at 9:15 a.m. in the morning. We'll take a short midmorning break and a lunch break from about 12:30 to 1:30 p.m., and then take a midafternoon break and end around 5:00.

You will spend most of your time during the trial either in the courtroom or in the jury room. I urge you not to leave your valuables in the jury room, your purses, your wallets, or anything of value. Keep your valuables with you.

So thank you very much for your attention, and

```
1
       we're now going to proceed with opening statements starting
2
      with plaintiffs' opening statement.
 3
                 Do you want a lapel mic? Would that be easier
       than holding it?
 4
 5
                MR. DuBOSE: This is probably easier.
 6
                 THE COURT: Okay. Fine, your preference.
 7
                MR. DuBOSE: What's in a name? Power, purpose,
 8
              I represent the plaintiffs in this case, Ruby
 9
       Freeman and Shaye Moss.
10
                My name is Von DuBose. I got my name from my
11
       father: Willie Lavon DuBose. Thank goodness they spared me
12
       the Willie. We don't have any Willie's here, do we?
13
                Okay. But if they had named me Willie Lavon
14
       DuBose, Jr., or the second, I would have been very proud to
15
      be Willie Lavon DuBose, Jr.
16
                 Why? Because names are important. It's one of
17
       the first thing a child learns. It's their name. Names are
18
       important. Names are significant. They often connect us to
19
       our family. They sometimes connect us to our homeland.
20
       They're descriptive. They often define us. They're
21
       important personally. They're important in business.
22
       They're often our personal brands in business.
23
                 Names are how people find us. Names are how
24
      people identify us. The great golfer Ben Hogan said, "Your
25
       name is the most important thing you own. Don't ever do
```